



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,126	01/18/2002	Che-Peng Liang	MR957-1137	5760

4586 7590 02/12/2004

ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE
3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101
ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3761

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/050,126

Applicant(s)

LIANG CHE-PANG

Examiner

Linh T Truong

Art Unit

3761

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in part c, the word "lighting" should be changed to **lightning**. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in part c, the word "similar" should be deleted. The word "similar" is relative. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

For claim 1, the phrase in a) "... supplying a power to a whole system thereof..." is indefinite. It is not known what "system" applicant is referring to. Does applicant mean to supply power to an ozone generating unit? It is suggested that Applicant be more specific.

Also for claim 1, the phrase in part c), "...**can happen for allowing** an ozone generating unit to generate ozone of high concentrations..." is indefinite. This implies that the electric discharge does not have to allow for an ozone generating unit to generate ozone but can only if ozone is what is needed. Since the method involves applying ozone over a wound, the ozone **must** be generated by an ozone generating unit. It is suggested that Applicant be more specific.

Note: If Applicant can overcome the above 112 rejections, the case is *most likely* allowable (subject to final approval) over prior art due to the "eliminating electromagnetic interference" claim language.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US patents 5,179,943 and 6,060,020 are drawn to apparatus for treating wounds with ozone. US patents 5,052,382, 6,110,431, and 6,426,053 B1 are drawn to ozone generators. US patent 6,283,986 B1 is drawn to a method of treating wounds with UVC radiation. And US patent 6,576,190 B1 is drawn to a method and apparatus for disinfecting bedclothes with UV rays and ozone. Japanese patent 01160805 A is drawn to an ozone generation method utilizing static electricity. Translated abstract of Swedish patent 853833B is drawn to neutralizing static electricity between electrodes and that prevents the formation of ozone.

Art Unit: 3761

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Linh Truong whose telephone number is 703-605-4974. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Fridays from 8:30am-5:30pm.

Linh Truong

L.T.

Glenn
GLENN K. DAWSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER